New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials —Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; C. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Lee, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage: IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

	One Year.	Six Months.	Three Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.75	.30
Sunday only, Canada	5.00	2.50	1.25	.50
FOREIGN RATES				
Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.25
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

It Won't Work

The decision of the President to call no extra session of Congress until after his return, in June or later, from a second journey to Europe will be read—seemingly, must be read—as born of a determination not to allow, if he can prevent it, any open discussion of his peace plan. The business of effectuating "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at," is to go on in secret. Having shut the door on all orderly public consideration of perhaps the most important question the country ever has had before it, the President apparently hopes to coerce a ratification of any plan he may bring home by tying it to the peace treaty proper.

The President has changed his mind since he said to Congress just before he took ship: "I shall be in close touch with you . . . and you will know all that I do." And again: "I shall not be inaccessible." And still again: "I am the servant of the people." A crossing of meridians has led him to lose his expressed love for pitiless publicity. The counsel of Congress and of the public wearies him. He would have an end to the nonsense of debate. He knows best. He will not be bothered as he pursues his high purposes.

The President has reverted to the mood he was in when, before the November election, he suggested—almost ordered—none be elected to Congress except those pledged to blind subservience; to the mood later revealed when, in a Liberty bond appeal, it was made plain the public would do its full duty by confining itself to bond purchases, leaving other matters to those specially charged with responsibility.

It is not feasible to lock up the press, even though Congress may be. The espionage law was not a perfect piece of legislation, but by inference all and several have had indicated to them what they should do. The country is to maintain respectful silence until a self-appointed messenger returns from Sinai with the tables of the law, and then every one is to shout hosanna. The assigned rôle is not acceptable.

The experiment of the President in seeking to rule without parliament is doubtless well meant, but will not succeed in a noisy and vocable democracy. If Charles I could not make the plan work; if Louis XVI could not make it work when he drove the National Assembly to meet in the Tennis Court; if the Czar could not make it work in Russia when he attempted to dissolve the Duma just before the revolution, it cannot be made to work in America. The new Congress has a later mandate from the people than any possessed by the President, and it will find ways to vindicate the principle that the legislative department, under the Constitution, is an integral part of the government, and is charged with responsibility touching the dispatch of public business.

Blunt old John Adams once declared: "Any man who controls my vote, or wants to control my vote, is an aristocrat"—meaning by that an enemy of democracy. The spirit of Adams is not entirely dead. The President has committed an amazing mistake—a blunder almost comparable to the one of Andrew Johnson when he assumed the privilege of settling the Civil War without regard to the wishes of Congress. The political dispute at Washington is widening into channels none expected.

The latest development is of such a character as to amply warrant, if not require, some real friend of the President to break in on his privacy and say: "It won't do. Americans also believe in the right of self-determination."

Two Democratic Forecasts

President Wilson will be the Democratic nominee in 1920, declares Norman E. Mack, formerly of the Democratic National Committee. "If we cannot win with President Wilson I do not know how we can win at all," he says, admitting the Democrats will be on the defensive because of "mistakes."

It is interesting to match Mr. Mack's views with those of another Democrat even better known, Colonel Henry Watterson, editor emeritus of "The Louisville Courier-Journal." Colonel Watterson, quoted extensively in a dispatch to "The St. Louis Globe-Democrat," agrees with Mr. Mack that Mr. Wilson can have the nomination if he so desires.

"The machinery is all in Mr. Wilson's hands; he can do what he pleases," is the way "Marse Henry" puts it. Popular opposition to a third term would be no obstacle, in Colonel Watterson's opinion, who declares that so far as he can see the Democratic party has ceased to be guided in the least by the ideal to which it once clung.

Where Colonel Watterson and Mr. Mack diverge is in forecasting the outcome of a contest with Mr. Wilson again the Democratic leader. "If we cannot win with Mr. Wilson, I don't know how we can win at all," says Mr. Mack. "Mr. Wilson can have the nomination if he wants it, but he can't be elected," says Colonel Watterson.

Choose the Right Leader

It is a pleasant augury of the character of the coming Republican House of Representatives that mere seniority and precedent are not to decide the contest for the Speakership. Had these two considerations, formerly so potent in Congress, been the controlling factors, rather than the good of the party and the even greater good of the country, the misfortune of Mr. Mann's election to that high office would have had to be faced. Instead, we take it now for granted that the choice will fall upon Mr. Gillett, of Massachusetts, upon whom the greater part of the forces opposed to the Illinois man have centred their strength.

Mr. Mann was not "right" on the war; he did not represent the Republican point of view at any time. He was opposed to preparedness and to a big navy and fought the reorganization of our army. And, in addition, he faces the past rather than the future; he belongs to a day that is past, to a school of politics that has been repudiated.

Conversely, Mr. Gillett stands for everything that Mr. Mann does not. The Massachusetts man has had a long and honorable career in Congress, and he represents the Republican party of to-day instead of that of the days of "Cannonism." To-night's Republican caucus will do the party and the country great service by choosing him as its candidate for the Speakership.

A Work That Should Go On

Congress is anxious to get the country back on a peace basis. But that is no reason for disbanding an agency like the United States Employment Service, which is needed to help place returning soldiers in old or new jobs.

While the war lasted this service was busy enrolling workers for war industries. There is an even broader field for it now in shifting labor back to non-war industries and in distributing the new labor supply created by the release of the fighting men. Such a distribution is an essential feature of any official reconstruction programme. Why should the government stand aside and leave it to the lumbering operations of the law of labor supply and demand, imperfectly accelerated by private employment agencies?

The Federal Employment Service has asked Congress for a deficiency appropriation of $2,932,000 to carry on its work from April 1 to July 1. By April 1 all the funds it has on hand will have been expended. The House Committee on Appropriations has rejected this plea. It has also failed to grant the service the allowance of $10,033,000 which the latter requested for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next.

This is wrong-headed economy. Unemployment means suffering. It also means economic waste. In a broad sense the facilitation of a maximum degree of employment is a proper governmental function. And to-day there are many special exigencies which make the continuance of the Federal service's activities a public necessity.

Bittersweet

Secretary Glass does not hold with the old-fashioned practitioner who held the patient's nose and poured the dose down his throat. Commending the $6,000,000,000 tax bill to the public, he advises the country to "pay it cheerfully."

It is to defray the expenses of a war that has brought us the "ineffable boon of peace," says Mr. Glass. "It is a shallow kind of patriotism," the Secretary continues, "that does not burn as brightly in the time of peace as the time of war," and "the government, therefore, appeals to that higher form of patriotism which is not dependent upon the shouting and the tumult."

So, says Mr. Glass, "pay cheerfully." And everybody will.

Thompsonism Still Grips Chicago

It was the familiar tactics of dividing the opposition that gave William Hale Thompson the Republican nomination for Mayor of Chicago last Tuesday. With the anti-Thompson vote split between Judge Harry Olson and Captain Charles E. Merriam, the Mayor of "the sixth German city" gained a renomination. His political mentor, Lundin, fully appreciated the opportunity.

Chairman Hays of the Republican National Committee saw the necessity of consolidating the anti-Thompson Republican votes. His influence and that of the leading Chicago newspapers was thrown to Judge Olson, who seemed to have the better chance of winning. In twenty-two years of holding public office, particularly as director of the Municipal Court of Chicago, Harry Olson had given evidence of real administrative talent.

Captain Merriam, a professor at the University of Chicago, was highly esteemed personally. His mistake lay in tactics. He fought both Thompson and Olson, antagonizing rather than converting adherents of both. Judge Olson directed his fire solely at Mayor Thompson.

Now Chicago has neglected another opportunity to rid the city of Thompsonism. The Mayor who declined to welcome Marshal Joffre and the French commission, who opposed sending troops, munitions and food to Europe, who protected anti-war meetings, who has shattered its civil service, has a good chance to continue in power.

The one remedy lies in the April election. The Democratic candidate, Robert M. Sweitzer, will have it out with Thompson, as he did four years ago, when Thompson won. But again the anti-Thompson vote will be distributed among four men and one woman, all of which looks good to William Hale Thompson.

Picking at the Bard

Edgar Lee Masters, whose "Spoon River Anthology" has tended to remove some of the prejudice against what is called Lazy Verse, says it would be ridiculous to write on modern day topics in Shakespeare's iambic pentameters or blank verse.

In spite of Burleson and what hasty critics say about Burleson, this is still, in some respects at least, a free country; and what Mr. Masters thinks he is at liberty to say. But others are also at liberty to think and say that perhaps the paucity of Shakepearian pentameters and blank verse is due to the lack of Shakespeares. It is possible, if there were such, with hands subdued to the dye in which they worked, Shakespeare's verse methods would be no insuperable obstacle to the expression of poetic ideas and feelings.

It is not Shakespeare so much as Whitman who is difficult to the average man. It may be Whitman presents the form of the future, but not the form of the present. He is esoteric, caviare to the general, more than the Elizabethan, who never saw a graveyard of Illinois or led a calf to water in New England, or had experience with the mingled roars of an African jungle, or dwelt in Greenwich Village, and felt like Thackeray as it consumed clam chowder and imagined it bouillabaisse.

No Settlement Out of Court

For Italy to submit to arbitration by an individual her claims to the eastern coast of the Adriatic would be to question the authority of the conference itself. More than this, she would by such an act belittle her own position as a member of that conference. If the Jugo-Slavs are confident their own claims are just, they should be willing to agree to the same procedure in their case as is to be followed in other cases.

What Italy asks is, first, the completion of her unity by the incorporation within her boundaries of those predominantly Italian lands, and, second, security for her long and exposed Adriatic coast line. Questions of racial affinity are not always easily determined, and in any case the delimitation could not be exact. There is no doubt, however, that many of the ports demanded by the Jugo-Slavs, even those where the Slav population is large, belong strategically, culturally and commercially to Italy. On the other hand, the Jugo-Slavs justly ask access to the sea, which would be denied to them if Italy took all the ports. Such does not seem Italy's intention. Last year there was an agreement between the Italians and the Jugo-Slavs apparently satisfactory to both.

With regard to the second point, a nation in Italy's geographical position cannot afford to leave naval strongholds threatening to her safety in the hands of a possible enemy. The Austrian possession of these strongholds was nicely calculated to lay her open to invasion. To say after all her sacrifices and sufferings in this war she must abandon hope of future protection is nothing less than absurd. A doctrine of no annexations worked out like this would compel us to give up Panama. The Italian delegates may well say they would not dare to go home if they consented to a similar surrender. If their security were similarly threatened, Americans would ask no less.

Perhaps President Wilson himself would not have accepted the task the Jugo-Slavs sought to thrust upon him. At any rate, he should be relieved by Italy's refusal, for it would be very unfortunate in every respect if he should be regarded as a mediator between nations, whether allied or enemy, apart from the body of which he is a member.

The Cost of Making Milk

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Living in the city, I am naturally anxious to buy milk as low as possible. Having a summer home in the country and knowing many farmers, I have been able to obtain inside facts on the farmers' side.

The popular idea in the city is that the farmer is getting rich by the sale of milk. However, I find that many farmers have sold their cows for beef and gone out of the milk business, saying that they could not make a living and had been losing money. They say that the price that they obtained for milk has not advanced as much as the cost of feed, labor and living expenses. The cost of cows has advanced from $35 or $40 to an average of $150 for the same kind of cows.

Feed has advanced from $9 to $12 a ton to $45 to $70 a ton. Help formerly cost $10 to $20 a month and now from $35 to $50, and not as good. Formerly help by the day was abundant at 75 cents to $1, and they boarded themselves; now it is scarce at $1.25 to $2 a day and they have to give them the noon meal. Flour has more than doubled in price, sugar and other groceries have greatly advanced.

After much inquiry I have been able to find few farmers who are even making expenses in the milk business.

CITY MAN.

Police Bribery?

(From The Cleveland Plain Dealer)

A St. Louis man has been fined $500 for trying to kiss a policewoman. What was the charge—attempted bribery?

The Conning Tower

On a Baked Apple, Received Yesterday from Pomfret, Conn.

The fruit of that forbidden tree
Whose mortal taste an Eden quaked
Appeals enormously to me,
Particularly baked.

Came yesterday that sugared myth,
A spiceless, coreless apple, from
The little town of Pomfret (with
The accent on the *pomme*).

Gramercy for the succulence
Of that so sweet pomonic boon;
And for the deep intelligence
To send along a spoon.

For wit ye well an such a fruit
Occasioned Eve her famous fall,
Why did they dim her bright repute
Or blame the dame at all?

Woodrow Wilson of Paris, who is spending a week in Washington, D. C., entertained a few at dinner last night. Conversation was indulged in till a late hour and a good time is said to have been had by all.

Grim visaged peace hath her wrinkled front no less than war, as the feller said.

THEY CAN'T GET TOO MANY LETTERS

Ex-Austrian Ship Radetzky, Spalato, Dalmatia, Feb. 1, 1919.

Sir: The Bridgeforce of this vessel are wondering whether you will bring this letter to the public eye for us. We are far away from any English speaking folk and word from home would sure go good.

We have hesitated to advertise for mail, but, knowing so many people would be glad to correspond, we have finally decided that recourse to this would be justifiable. You know we gobs over here have absolutely nothing to look forward to except *mail*. Liberty is infrequent, and when we do get ashore we are as much at sea as if we were on the Adriatic, as none of us can speak the language.

The following men therefore are requesting that some Tower readers take our cause to heart:

Reynold Bunker	Warren Zeigler
Lester R. Houghtaling	Grant D. Swisher
	Benjamin Siegel
Campbell Gex	Chester G. Dettmer
C. H. Virbin	Albert J. Cammerer

Address U. S. S. Olympia, Postmaster, New York. Care of Radetzky.

Problem in quantitative hydraulics: If it takes a man until 1 a. m. to accumulate a state of neutrality under the present high proof combustibles, what time, in the era of one-half of one per cent, will he come home?

PROHIBITION GAG NO. 785,391

[Tax: 3 per cent]

Puncture the Prohibition law
And I venture you'll make a name;
Yea, the Mucilage Trust will install your bust
In the Alcohall of Fame.

EDAR.

If it isn't one thing—and it's eight or nine—that makes anti-Prohibitionists it's another. Another is the way the Prohibitionists keep on arguing after they have won. Or, if they must rub it in, why not give us an alcohol rub?

Some of the men who report sick on a hangover morning should wear buttons reading: "No Work: Beer."

THE ANCHOR

In the hulk of a broken ship-some landsman's fancy sought it—
A ship that had ranged the tides with a captain of renown;
Up from the voice of the sea and the sea's old lure he brought it,
And here it rests on the green of a placid inland town.

Once it had known the floor of many a distant ocean,
Capri's celestial blue and the coral Caribbees;
Once it had stoutly held in many a wild commotion—
Now the cropped turf clings round it under the murmuring trees.

But yonder hill-bred lad, pausing to look as he passes,
Can, with the vision of youth, the vast blue plain behold,
Or breast the clamorous gale and the waves' engulfing masses—
A shy and obscure Odysseus, whose hazards are never told! G. S. B.

What bewilders J. D. G. is whether the sign fronting the Winter Garden, "A Chorus of Unparalled Beauty," means "A Chorus of Unparalleled Beauty" or "A Chorus of Unapparelled Beauty."

We haven't despaired utterly of getting our final pay check from the army, but we are willing to match the War Department double or nothing.

Captain Harvey Dunn, who was one of the eight official artists of the A. E. F., is at home again, after nearly a year of foreign service. Captain Dunn was at Château Thierry in early June, and a fearlesser artist never was seen. When he returned to his billet at A. P. O. 731, he found these verses at his place at mess:

You may talk o' qualms an' fear,
When you're quartered over here
In the neighborhood of Meaux and Château Thierry;
But the boy with the begonia
Is the Captain from Leonia
(Which is near the 130th Street Ferry).
Now in France's rainy clime,
Where I've put in lots of time
A-makin' nasty faces at the Hun,
Of all the lads I know
In the scrap at Neufchâteau,
There was none of 'em like Captain Harvey Dunn.
O it's Dunn, Dunn, Dunn!
You mountain range o' valor, Harvey Dunn!
Though I've kidded you and guyed you,
By the livin' Gawd that made you,
You're a braver man than I am, HarveyDunn!

Thus it is stated that the total expenditures of America and the Allies were $18,375,000,000, of which Great Britain spent $37,100,000,000, France $27,000,000,000, the United States $18,481,000,000, Russia $18,000,000,000, Italy $10,000,000,000, and Serbia $8,000,000,000.—Col. Harvey's Weekly.

"But," concedes Beasley, "you can't expect the Colonel to give all his time to checking up on the President and still have time to devote to mathematics and proofreading."

From the Diary of John Rowe, a Boston merchant, Janunry 17, 1774: "I dined at Childs' in Roxbury."

Though this department stood for unConditional surrender,
In colyuming it's never one
To be a Bitter Ender.

F. P. A.

The Truth About Seattle

The Human and Emotional Aspects of the Recent Strike

By Kenneth Macgowan

ARTICLE II

Seattle, Wash., February 26.

A STRIKE is complex enough in its emotions, in the desires which drive men proverbially "a week from the poorhouse" to give up their livelihood. A general strike such as Seattle has had is complexity worse compounded. No one can catalogue all the reasons that led 30,000 men and women to stop work in sympathy with 25,000 already on strike, and the reactions that filled 75,000 unorganized workers, who either joined them voluntarily or were forced out by the general breakdown of industry. No one can know just how many felt this or that. But it is safe to say that five main motives ruled the general strike. In the order of their magnitude, of the relative number of men and women who probably felt them, they are:

The desire to "blow off steam," to gain a short vacation from the humdrum of both labor and of ordinary vacations, to have a little excitement, to liberate and dramatize the pent-up emotions of two years of hard, driving, strikeless work. This on the part of the large body of unorganized workers and unionists who seldom go to labor meetings.

The desire to express sympathy for the striking shipyard workers, to secure for the common laborer on the ships a wage that they felt his living conditions required, and to strike at an outsider—Charles Piez, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, who, they felt, blocked local adjustment in favor of Eastern yards. This on the part of the large body of organized workers who attend union meetings, but do not achieve office.

The desire to express and emphasize the solidarity of labor, to make the employers feel (before the discharged soldiers flood the labor market and create the potentional strikebreakers that lurk in unemployment) that Seattle labor is too strong for curbing, too united to tolerate reductions in wages. This on the part of active union men and leaders.

The desire to try a little rehearsal of "the social revolution," to experiment a bit with the facts and emotions of "taking over industry." This on the part of a few intellectuals and a very few Socialist labor leaders.

The desire to see actual revolution a fact, the belief that a general strike of American workers of to-day would culminate in the overthrow of capitalism and of representative government. This on the part of perhaps three labor figures and a small army of I. W. W. leaders entirely outside the Seattle labor unions—these jokingly or contemptuously referred to by labor men as "wobblies."

I do not believe that any considerable portion of Seattle labor was against striking. I think the largest body of emotion was the desire to blow off steam and go with the crowd. It is a simple and understandable thing. We have seen it throughout the country, notably in the East. Since November 11 strike has followed strike in bewildering succession.

The ordinary processes of modern industry make such a situation natural. On the one hand, the personal relationship of employer and employe, workman and masterworkman, has long disappeared. Routine mechanical relationships, colored with no human loyalties, have taken its place. On the other hand, industry itself, the forms and methods of work, have become laregly routine and mechanical. To talk of this aspect of modern industry is to utter truisms that are now platitudes. The major result is a humdrum quality in labor, even when it is not a grinding, hurrying strain. That breeds the desire for relief. Not mere rest, but positive spiritual reaction, denial of routine, assertion of "freedom." The secondary result is that little or no normal human relationship of the worker to his factory or shop superiors remains to make the rebellion of the strike a difficult spiritual break.

Add to this normal fact in modern labor the further fact of the war. The fact of reading of action and never meeting it. The fact of working for eighteen months without a thought of general interruption. The fact of never a serious strike in all the United States. We have had the emotional strain of modern industry without its natural reactions. And if, during the war, a worker watched prices rising faster than wages, a defiant sense of injury came as well.

The problem of the present strike epidemic is a problem for the psychiatrist as much as the economist.

Nobody in Seattle is thinking this today. The upper-middle classes are contemplating with relief or satisfaction the ruins of revolution. They are "drawing the finger shaudderingly along the meat axe." They are offering up prayer, and burning incense before the shrine of Ole Hanson. Or they are laying plans—and executing them—for a "house cleaning" of labor.

As for the strikers who went out for a lark—or a consecration—most of them have returned badly frightened by the wraiths of Bolshevism they were made to see.

Most, but not all. Many must feel like the non-union elevator boy who said: "Aw, I guess we can take care of them 'wobblies' anytime we want another day off."

Aloofness Impossible

By Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The editorial "Aloofness Impossible" in The Tribune of February 21 puts the discussion of the plan for a league of nations upon solid ground. A society of nations is wholly in accord with Republican traditions, Republican principles and well established Republican policy. The only formal declaration known to me to have been made on this subject by any party convention in the United States is that adopted by the Republican State Convention held at Saratoga on July 19 last. That declaration reads as follows:

"We favor the immediate creation by the United States and its allies of a league of nations to establish, from time to time to modify, and to enforce, the rules of international law and conduct. The purpose of this league should be, not to displace patriotism or devotion and loyalty to national ideals and traditions, but rather to give to these new opportunities of expression in coöperation with the other liberty loving nations of the world. To membership in this league any nation might be admitted that possesses a responsible government which will abide by those rules of law and equity, and by those principles of international justice and morality which are accepted by civilized people."

It would be most unfortunate for this question to become a partisan one, or to fail of consideration on its merits regardless of any party declaration hithero made. Nevertheless, it may be helpful for Republicans to ask whether the draft plan that has been submitted for discussion and amendment, as a result of the preliminary work of the peace conference at Paris, is or is not a league of the type described in the declaration just quoted. If it is a league of this type, it will be a logical deduction from the foreign policies of the McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft administrations, illuminated by the lessons of the war. If it is not a league of this type, then we may well strive to shape it so that it will become such while the plan is still open to discussion and amendment. Blindly to oppose any better form of world organization because we do not like some of the details of the plan now proposed, is political madness, as well as in the highest degree reactionary.

The draft plan is so ill drawn and so full of unnecessary difficulties that its critics will have an easy task in making those facts plain to the people. The constructive critic, however, will not content himself with opposition to any plan whatsoever because he does not like some of the points of this plan, but will endeavor to show how it may be transformed into a wiser and a better plan.

It is probable that the difficulties in the way of acceptance by the Senate and the American people generally of any plan for a society of nations may be summarized under two heads: First, agreement upon the principles of international law and international administration which are hereafter to prevail in the world; and, second, agreement upon a method for their enforcement that will not displace the Monroe Doctrine.

If the votes of the two Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 be taken as a starting point, it should not be difficult to put into the draft plan a succinct statement of principles of international law and conduct upon which the whole civilized world will agree. The question will then arise as to the enforcement of these principles. There are grave objections to any plan which will compel America to accept responsibility for matters of international administration in Europe, in Asia or in Africa, and there are equally grave objections to any plan that will substitute for the Monroe Doctrine international control on the part of the nations of Europe and Asia of matters affecting the American continents alone. It might be worth while to consider whether, given a single code of principles of international law and international administration, the world might not then be divided into three administrative areas: First, Europe, Africa and the parts of Asia immediately adjoining Europe and Africa; second, the American continents, and, third, the Orient, including Japan, China and Siam.

Should these three administrative areas be created, all owing allegiance to a common code of law and principle, then the world would have, in effect, a Monroe Doctrine for each area, and the original Monroe Doctrine would be preserved unharmed and unamended. Should any exceptional breach of international law and order take place within a given administrative area, as when Germany invaded Belgium in 1914, which the forces of law and order within that area were unable to subdue, the similar forces in one or both of the other administrative areas could then be called upon to take part in upholding the principles to which all alike had given allegiance.

Americans, and especially Republicans, will recall two striking sentences in President McKinley's last speech, delivered at Buffalo, on September 5, 1901:

"No nation can longer be indifferent to any other."

"The period of aloofness is past."

These declarations marked the beginning of a new world attitude on the part of the people of the United States. The proposals contained in Theodore Roosevelt's address before the Nobel Prize Committee, delivered at Christiania, Norway, on May 5, 1910, should not be overlooked at this time, since some of them go even beyond the provisions of the present draft plan. This, for example:

"It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power, of any police power, to enforce the decrees of the courts."

For several generations the American government has had a large part in the development and establishment of international law and order. On many occasions, through resolutions of the Congress, through executive declarations, through diplomatic correspondence, through special treaties and through participation in numerous international conferences and conventions, the American people have exerted farreaching influence in making international law and in developing an international public opinion. Republicans in particular must not allow their justifiable resentment at the President's methods and policies to drive them into an unstatesmanlike attitude, and one wholly out of harmony with their long tradition, on the greatest question now before the court of public opinion.

New York, Feb. 25, 1919.

Letters to The Tribune

The Hearst Mockery

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We of the A. E. F. who have survived, whose greatest reward has been to emerge from the conflict alive; we, who will receive the great welcome, to whom the people tell each other they owe so much, we often wonder at the actual mockery of our situation.

Narrowing my field as spokesman from the views of the whole A. E. F. to the opinion of one division, the 27th, I suggest that if the home coming of this division is going to be celebrated as such a wondrous event, a reception of love and appreciation, cannot politics be forgotten for the time being, or at least placed aside? Why appoint as president of the reception committee a man who has made himself disliked throughout the "olive drab brotherhood" by his unsympathetic attitude toward the cause that required the utmost of sympathy from all true and loyal Americans?

That the name of William Randolph Hearst should head the committee to receive the division is in itself a mockery of the sincerity of the whole affair.

The strength of criticism that I desire to put forth in connection with this point suffers restraint, due to the fact that army censorship still exists throughout the A. E. F.

Rather let us return unnoticed, New York, than deliberately mock us!

BURKMAN, Machine Gunner.

Coudrecieux, France, Feb. 9, 1919.

The Costs of Pacifism

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I hope you will permit me to express my admiration of your editorial "The Costs of Pacifism." The time is not far distant when plain speaking will seem so imperative a duty that it will be indulged in regardless of any idol it may overtopple. That the war would have been over two years before it was if Wilson had only known what it was about, should find lodgement in the mind of every citizen. But Mr. Wilson fooled his fellow countrymen with his neutrality proclamation, as since he has fooled Europe with his humanitarian platitudes, and next to his injustice in keeping the United States out of the war is his injustice in terminating it with his typewriter instead of solely by force of arms. President Wilson's secret idea of the war seems to have been, and apparently is, that it is a happening that could be utilized to his (Wilson's) personal advantage. Even his own Democratic party is not to share to any appreciable extent in his personal triumph except in a reflected way.

JOHN D. ELWELL.

New York, Feb. 24, 1919.

Goose Creek for League with Teeth

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A league of nations with an imposing array of naval and military power behind it sufficient to enforce its mandates would have some standing in the eyes of the Huns—nothing less would. Let the league of nations be thus equipped, otherwise it would better be strangled at birth.

Not one foot of ground should Germany be allowed to hold west of the Rhine throughout its whole length. The Rhine is the logical boundary between Germany and France. It were better that Belgium and Luxemburg should voluntarily become part of a greater France extending eastward to the Rhine and northward to the Scheldt, no matter what the German-sympathizing Hollanders may think about it. There should be a France able to protect herself against any German menace like that under which she lived for so many unhappy years.

All success to a league of nations if we go at it right. ZEB GAINES.

Goose Creek, L. I., Feb. 26, 1919.

How Blunt John Adams Put It

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "Any man," said blunt old John Adams, "who controls, or wants to control, my vote is an aristocrat." Since this government was established we have successfully worked on the theory that all men who are not idiots and criminals are competent before the law, at the age of twenty-one, to vote in their own way and manage their own affairs. A plain man is quite within his rights in refusing to listen to any one who assumes that he does not know what he is about, and that he needs advice. No good American will submit to political dictation. W. P. REEVES.

Gambier, Ohio, Feb. 22, 1919.

Red Cross Workers Wanted

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The American Red Cross maintains a workroom and units on the lower East Side where garments for refugees are made. There is great need for these garments, and the assistance we are now receiving is so inadequate that we are far from making the progress necessary to meet the demand. Therefore, we would very much appreciate whatever time our neighbors could give in volunteer work. Come. Bring your friends, and help those less fortunate than yourselves.

RED CROSS LOWER EAST SIDE AUXILIARY, 197 East Broadway.

New York, Feb. 24, 1919.

Make All Roosevelt Boys

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I suggest what I would think prove to be a lasting memorial to Theodore Roosevelt—his book, "The Foes of Our Own Household," be made a standard high school book for our boys and girls. No better book could be used to make them just what Theodore Roosevelt would have all boys and girls grow up to be—good Americans. The book is dedicated to Roosevelt's sons and daughters. Why not dedicate this book to our boys and girls?

R. L. HUTCHINSON.

New York, Feb. 24, 1919.